DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 915 EA 011 676

AUTHOR Lytle, James H.
TITLE Resource Allocation Procedures Viewed From Within the Administrative Structure of Large Urban Schools.
PUB DATE 11 Apr 79
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979); Not available in paper copy due to light print of original document

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Budgeting; Educational Finance; Educational Resources; Elementary Secondary Education; Principals; *Resource Allocations; School Administration
IDENTIFIERS Philadelphia Public Schools PA

ABSTRACT

As one considers the almost incredible array of guidelines, regulations, requirements, and contract provisions affecting the allocation of the local school's resources, one must wonder how it is possible to conduct the business of the school at all. Time is not traditionally considered a resource, and local school administrators are rarely trained in using time resources well, particularly in the scheduling and rostering process. This is unfortunate, since teachers' work time is the resource most clearly under the administrator's control, and may also be the most significant educational resource when used well. This document provides a brief overview of the local school administrator's role in resource allocations, from the standpoint of one administrator in the Philadelphia public school system. Financial and regulatory constraints and the problems of central office control are touched on. Appendices illustrate documents used by Philadelphia's local school administrators in school-level budgeting. (Author/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED170915

"Resource Allocation Procedures Viewed From Within the Administrative Structure of Large Urban Schools"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dr. James H. Lytle
Principal
Parkway Program
School District of Philadelphia

A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 11, 1979, San Francisco, Calif. Not for distribution or reproduction without the written permission of the author.

EA 011 676

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Lytle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

"Resource Allocation Procedures Viewed From Within the Administrative Structure of Large Urban Schools"

James H. Lytle

My purpose is to provide a touch of candor to a discussion of policy making, program budgets, resource allocation strategies and theoretical models. I have the advantage (or disadvantage) of being one of those out in the schools who must translate those fat budget books into teaching for kids. I'd like to start by describing the budgeting process as it actually works for the principal of an urban school; I assume that the process in Philadelphia is reasonably similar to that in other large systems since all big cities work with the same general constraints--such as class size restrictions spelled out in teacher contracts.

I've provided you with a set of the directives and forms that principals in Philadelphia work with in determining the number of staff and the amount of money their schools will get for the coming school year. Let's start with the first document "Classification of Schools". As you can see, schools are evaluated in six different criteria: number of teachers, number of special education teachers, percentage of inexperienced teachers, number of teacher vacancies, pupil mobility, and enrollment from outside school boundaries. The total score determines school classification and thereby principal's salary level.

The second document (p. 4) indicates the formulas used in determining staff allocations. As you can see, these allotments are based primarily on enrollment; the teacher/student staffing ratio is lowest for senior highs and

highest for elementary school; junior high and middle schools fall in between. The ratio is adjusted for secondary schools in relation to attendance and standardized achievement test performance. Low attendance decreases the teacher allotment; low achievement test scores increase the allotment slightly.

These formulas generate the staff allotment for each school (see p. 6). This allocation form is actually the major school-level budget document; each teaching position is worth roughly $20,000. Thus, the document you're looking at represents about $1,200,000. A principal has the authority to make "trade-offs" within personnel categories, but he cannot trade-off personnel for increased book or equipment funds. Legitimate trade-offs would include dropping an English position and adding a Math position, or trading a teaching position for two classroom aides. The "Trade-off Guidelines" documents (pp. 7 & 8) give some sense of the boundaries imposed on this process. Since a reduction in teaching positions is likely to increase class size beyond contractual limits, it is almost impossible to trade-off teaching positions in any but the largest schools. One other point; if a trade of one teaching position for another results in a dollar saving (e.g., an experienced business teacher being paid $25,000 is replaced with a relatively inexperienced English teacher being paid $15,000), the dollar savings do not accrue to the school. All positions are treated as if they had a standard value.

There are two other types of school-level expenditures over which a Philadelphia principal has direct control--book, material and supply funds and extra-curricular activity payrolls. Turn to pages 11 and 12 for examples of the Supply and Book allotment forms. The areas I've enclosed in dark lines are the standard per pupil cost factors. These are multiplied by the appropriate grade level or course enrollments for sub-totals. The grand totals represent

the school's entire cash supply for a school year. My school will receive $20,650 for the 1979-80 school year to buy all books, ditto paper, reading kits and pencils for over 1200 students. That's about $17 per student. When you consider that a single Biology text book may cost $15, you have some sense of what a preposterously small amount that is. And if we need a new film projector, it must be bought from these same funds. To put it another way, the amount available for all books and supplies is 1½ % of the total spent for salaries and employee benefits at my school. When one talks about reallocation and accountability at the school level, that's a good statistic to keep in mind. The extra-curricular payroll I referred to provides overtime funds to pay teachers for conducting intramural sports, dramatics, debate, after-school tutoring, and so on (see pp. 13 & 14 in your packet for examples). These funds reflect, to a certain degree, school district priorities, but might more accurately be described as compromises tossed in during the closing moments of teacher contract negotiations. My school is receiving $24,000 this year to pay overtime to teachers (more than we get for books and supplies). Everyone in the school, including the union representative, agrees that many of the activities paid for with this money are really charades and that the money would be better spent on equipment, furniture, a Xerox machine. No matter. It can only be used for the activities designated in the teacher contract.

Constraints

I think it is important to consider the constraints that bound school-level budgeting. Although some of those I will enumerate have greatest effect at the system-wide level, all determine what is possible in a school.

As a condition of Title I, ESEA funding, the federal government requires comparability across all schools at a given level within a system. For example, if one high school is given an extra reading specialist from the operating budget, then all other senior high schools must also be given one. Title IX provisions require equal expenditures for male and female students. And the Office of Civil Rights requires teacher racial balance at all schools, thus restricting flexibility in staffing arrangements.

The State requires that instruction be provided by appropriately certified teachers and prescribes the amount of instruction in various areas (e.g., 4 credits in English and 2 credits in mathematics in senior high schools, each credit constituting at least 120 hours of instruction).

The teacher contract limits class size and personnel trade-offs, determines teacher assignment and transfer policies, fixes salaries and increments, prescribes the number of periods per day and the duties teachers may be assigned, specifies the length of the work day, and requires that each school allocate $25 per teacher from its book and supply funds for their unilateral use.

One example of the effect of the combination of State guidelines and teacher contract provisions is that there must be roughly twice as many English as math teachers in a senior high, given credit requirements and class size limitations.

The School District itself requires that all books and supplies on

approved lists must be purchased from designated vendors, although unlisted items may be purchased directly. Schools may purchase through three mechanisms; petty cash accounts are used for expenditures of $50 or less; direct purchase orders may be used for expenditures of $50 to $300; for larger amounts, requisitions are submitted to a central purchasing office. Furniture and major equipment is only available through an ephemeral central contingency fund. Pupils may not be charged for books. Substitute teachers are centrally budgeted; schools may not accrue money or days of service by making internal arrangements to cover absences. As indicated earlier, no funds allocated for personnel services may be used for other expenditures.

As one considers this almost incredible array of guidelines, regulations, requirements, and contract provisions, perhaps the most pertinent observation is to wonder how it is possible to conduct the business of school at all. The answer lies, in my view, in the fact that the significant resource allocation decisions in school systems are not made by Superintendents, or Boards, or Finance Directors. These decisions have very little to do with money and a great deal to do with the allocations of personal time, particularly the work time of teachers. The most significant allocation process in school systems is the rostering or scheduling done within each school.

Since teachers represent slightly more than half of the full-time employees in the school system and their salaries represent about half of the total annual expenditures in the system, the decisions relating to the use of their time are in fact the system's major program decisions, and of course the ones most directly affecting the district's instructional program.

In large school systems like Philadelphia the Finance Division has absolutely no involvement in the rostering process and doesn't even begin to understand what it's about. That suits principals and teachers just fine, because control over the most meaningful part of the budget lies within schools, beyond the "interference" of the Board or central office. Even the availability of computerized scheduling has had little impact in Philadelphia. The "roster room" remains the decision center of each school. It is here that administrators and select teachers determine who in the school teaches what, where and to whom--what teachers get the honors students, the best classrooms, the most convenient schedules, the smallest classes, or the most "released" periods (see Period Allowances, p. 9). Will students needing remedial reading instruction get two or five periods a week of help? Will these periods be early in the day or after lunch? Will there be a Social Studies electives program this year? Will Biology labs be one or two periods? And so on. A principal who does not understand this process is like a Finance Director who cannot read a budget. He will be unable to translate instructional priorities into real services to students.

It's my observation that in fact all too few urban school principals really understand the relationship between rostering or scheduling and program planning and implementation. The process might accurately be conceived as a resource allocation process, yet principals and their subordinates have very little training in decision theory or resource allocation models. They have the power to translate resources into programs. Unfortunately they do not have the tools. If there is any place in public education where economic and decision models and computer technology could be fruitfully employed, it is in this rostering/scheduling process. Schools and their administrators

might have to surrender some of their present autonomy, but there is tremendous potential for greater efficiency and effectiveness in reviewing urban school-level scheduling systmes. In other words, the strategies and techniques of analysis currently employed at district-wide levels ought to be applied to school-level decisions.

There are a few other issues of school-level finance that I'd like to comment on briefly. The first is that in Philadelphia, at least, it is virtually impossible to determine the real cost of particular schools. The problem relates partly to the myriad funding sources for school-level services--Special Education, Title I, C.E.T.A., etc. A second part of the problem derives from the fact that certain school-level services--for example, security officers, substitute teachers or bus transportation, are centrally budgeted. This situation makes it extremely difficult to compute accurate per pupil cost figures or potential savings from school closings.

Another concern is that budget reduction decisions, which seem endemic in urban school systems, are always made at the central office level. Given the constraints I outlined earlier, it's understandable why this seems necessary. Yet school-level personnel, since they have no involvement in the process, come to see themselves as victims rather than participants in the process. Any sense of joint enterprise is lost.

A third concern is that the per pupil cost of urban public schools now equals or exceeds that of very exclusive private schools which provide better services and facilities. Our projected per pupil cost in Philadelphia next year in the general fund is almost $3000; when categorical fund sources are

added on, as for example ESEA Title I support for disadvantaged students, the per pupil cost increases to $3,500 - $4,000. The quality of services we provide at that cost is inexcusably poor. An examination of this issue would be the topic for another paper, but clearly the current situation is outrageous.

I don't consider this paper as particularly romantic or profound. Through my comments, the handout I've provided you, and the issues I've raised, I hope I've given you a sense of what budget and finance mean at the school level. The schedule or roster is the only real resource allocation tool a principal has access to; other allocation decisions are comparatively inconsequential.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
21st STREET SOUTH OF THE PARKWAY
19103

MICHAEL P. MARCASE
Superintendent of Schools

CHARLES A. HIGHSMITH
Deputy Superintendent for Field Operations
299-7665

February 15, 1978

File No. 300

TO: All Principals

FROM: Charles A. Highsmith

SUBJECT: Classification of Schools - 1978

The classification data for your school are enclosed.

For your information, the following factors and point values were used in determining the classification of each school:

1. Number of Classroom Teachers

	No.	Points
Elementary	Less than 16.6	10
	16.6 to less than 21.1	20
	21.1 to less than 25.8	30
	25.8 to less than 30.5	40
	30.5 or more	50
Junior and Middle	Less than 68.1	50
	68.1 or more	60
Senior and Voc. - Tech.	Less than 51	50
	51 to less than 120.8	60
	120.8 or more	70

2. Number of Special Education Teachers

No.	Points
2 - 5	2
6 - 10	4
11 - 15	6
16 or more	8

(Note: 1. Teachers of grades 7 and 8 in elementary schools were included with special education teachers in determining the number of points for this factor.

2. For Special Class Centers only, the point values for this factor are double the above.)

(1)

3. Teachers with Less Than Two Years Experience

Percent	Points
10 - 19	1
20 - 29	2
30 - 39	3
40 - 49	4
50 - 59	5
60 - 69	6
70 - 79	7
80 - 89	8

4. Teacher Vacancies

No.	Points
2 - 4	1
5 - 9	2
10 or more	3

5. Average Monthly Pupil Mobility

Percent	Points
5 - 8	1
9 - 12	2
13 - 16	3
17 or more	4

6. Magnet Enrollment from Outside Boundary/Total Enrollment

Percent	Points
5 - 9	1
10 - 14	2
15 - 19	3
20 or more	4

(Note: Replacement Schools: A principal of an existing school who has been designated as the principal of the replacement school opening during the calendar year of 1977 assumes the classification, if higher, of the replacement school.)

School classification appeals, based on factors other than those included in the formula, may be made. For your information, the procedure is listed below:

1. Principal writes letter to the district superintendent stating those factors which make the school unique.

2. District Superintendent screens all requests and supports or denies them and advises principal.

2

SCHOOL: PARKWAY DATE: JANUARY, 1978

PRINCIPAL: JAMES LYTLE DISTRICT: TWO

			Subtotals
# Classroom teachers:	59	Points: 60	
# Special Ed. teachers:	0	Points: 0	
% Teachers less than 2 yrs. exp.	3	Points: 0	
# Teachers vacancies:	0	Points: 0	
% Avg. monthly pupil mobility:	9	Points: 2	
% Magnet enrollment from outside boundary/total enrollment:	0	Points: 0	
		Total Points: 62	
		Classification: 6	

'77 Classification: 6

3

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
21st STREET SOUTH OF THE PARKWAY
19103

MICHAEL P. MARCASE
Superintendent of Schools

CHARLES A. HIGHSMITH
Deputy Superintendent
for Field Operations

File #300

April 20, 1978

To: District Superintendents
Principals of Senior/AVT High Schools

From: Charles A. Highsmith CAH

SUBJECT: Factors and Allowances - 1978-79

The following factors and allowances are considered in determining personnel allocations for senior/AVT schools for 1978-79:

Teachers -

A. Basic

1. Senior
   1 teacher/23 pupils (for first 920 pupils)
   1 teacher/28 pupils (for excess of 920 pupils)

2. Technical
   1 teacher/20 pupils

B. Achievement Adjustment (See attached category list)

Category 1 = 2.0 teachers/1000 pupils
Category 2 = 1.5 teachers/1000 pupils
Category 3 = 1.0 teacher/1000 pupils
Category 4 = 0.5 teacher/1000 pupils

C. Supplementary Allowances

Annex	Determined by enrollment at annex and accessibility of home school
Child Care	.5 teacher/full program
COE; DE; WE	.4 teacher/program
Shop	Determined by shop program
Other	Depending on resource availability, allocation will be made for special programs approved by deputy superintendent for Field Operations.

D. Average Daily Attendance

Average Daily Attendance	Teacher Reduction
100% - 88%	0
87% - 83%	4%
82% - 78%	5%
77% - 73%	6%
72% or less	7%

4

(over please)

Other Positions	Allocation
Vice Principal	Allocation dependent upon pupil enrollment: 1. Four for school with enrollment of 4400 or more. 2. Three for school with enrollment greater than 3400 and less than 4400. 3. Two for school with enrollment of 3400 or less.
Counselor	Average: One per 540 pupils
Librarian	One per school
Clerk - Stock	One per school where such service is not provided through other resources
Non-Teaching Assistant and School Aide II	Allocation dependent upon the following considerations: 1. Pupil enrollment 2. Lack of other supportive services 3. Prevalence of serious incident reports 4. Community environs 5. Magnitude of lunch program 6. Enrollment of annexes
Science Lab Assistant	One per school
Secretary	Allocation dependent upon the following considerations: 1. Pupil enrollment 2. Pupil mobility 3. Average daily absence 4. Enrollment of annexes

---

Please note that each teacher is to be assigned five prep periods per week.

5

SCHOOL Parkway

DATE _____ CODE _____

Senior High	76	77	77	78
Program 04	ACT	GEN	GEN	
Principal	013	1	/	
Vice Principal				
Ed. Prog. Planner		1		
DEPT. HEADS, COORD.	013	1	/	
Agriculture				
Commerce				
English		1	/	
Ind. Arts				
Languages				
Mathematics				
Phys. Educ.				
Science				
Soc. Studies				
LIBRARIAN	008			
COUNSELOR	010	1	/	
TEACHERS:		57.2	57	
Art	002	1		
Business	021	5		
Bookkeeping				
Bus. Ed. Workshop				
Clerical Prac.				
Distrib. Educ.				
Distribution				
Duplicating				
Key Punch				
Stenog - Gregg				

	76	77	77	78
	ACT	GEN	GEN	
Business, Contd.				
Stenog - Pitman				
Typing				
Data Processing				
Driver Ed.	025			
English	015	13		
Lang. Skills	007	3		
Home Econ.	016			
Language, Foreign:	107			
French		2		
German				
Hebrew				
Italian				
Latin				
Spanish				
Mathematics	018	11		
Music, Inst.	006			
Music, Vocal		.2		
Phys. Ed. Men	005	1		
Phys. Ed. Women				
Science	019	8		
Biology				
Chemistry				
Physics				
Social Studies	020	13		

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

BOARD OF EDUCATION

21st STREET SOUTH OF THE PARKWAY

19103

Michael P. Marcase
Superintendent of Schools

CHARLES A. HIGHSMITH
Deputy Superintendent
for Field Operations

File #300

April 14, 1977

TO: District Superintendents
Principals

FROM: Charles A. Highsmith CAH

SUBJECT: TRADE-OFF GUIDELINES FOR THE 1977-1978 PROGRAMS 01 TO 05

1. Trade-offs must be consistent with School District objectives and priorities and must strengthen the instructional program.

2. All trade-off requests must be approved by the district superintendents and the Deputy Superintendent for Field Operations.

3. Trade-offs are authorized for one year at a time; requests for trade-offs must be renewed each year.

4. Trade-offs may not be used to increase administrative positions in a school.

5. Personnel (Class 100) may not be traded for non-personnel items (Class 200, 300, 400, 500).

6. Trade-off requests may be made within Class 100 and among Class 300, 400, and 500.

7. When authorized, trade-offs will be made in accordance with the following equivalences based on the position of teacher as unity:

a.	Classroom Aide	.47
b.	Non-teaching Assistant	.67
c.	Noontime Aide	.18
d.	School Aide II (Matron)	.69
e.	Secretary	.56
f.	Teacher	1.00

bs

7

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

BOARD OF EDUCATION

21st STREET SOUTH OF THE PARKWAY

19103

Michael P. Marcase
Superintendent of Schools

CHARLES A. HIGHSMITH
Deputy Superintendent
for Field Operations

File #300

March 18, 1977

TO: Principals of Secondary Schools

FROM: Charles A. Highsmith Charlie

SUBJECT: EXTRA-CURRICULAR (EC) SERVICES - POSITION TRADE-OFF

The option to increase instructional services in exchange for reducing the teacher allotment is offered again for the 1977-78 school year. In schools where the allotment is reduced, teachers may accept additional instructional services, lengthen their day, and continue to perform EC services.

For such schools that accept the reduced allotment, guidelines follow:

1. Each increase of 25 periods per week of instructional services among those teachers who have previously been receiving roster compensation for EC services will reduce the allotment by one teacher.

2. Those teachers who continue to perform the EC services, increase their instructional services and lengthen their school day, will receive monetary compensation rather than roster compensation.

3. The EC services must be performed at the school.

4. Unless the Office for Field Operations approves a change -
   a. The maximum reduction will be three teachers.
   b. The maximum remuneration for a teacher will be 3 3/4 hours per week at the prevailing EC hourly rate.
   c. The total number of EC hours allocated to all teachers in exchange for one teacher must not exceed 18 3/4 hours.

5. Accurate and up-to-date records indicating the number of EC hours served by each participating teacher must be maintained at the school.

Please complete the attached form and return it to the Office for Field Operations, Room 601, Administration Building, by APRIL 12, 1977.

bs

enc.

8

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
21st STREET SOUTH OF THE PARKWAY
19103

MICHAEL P. MARCASE
Superintendent of Schools
Richard D. Hanusey
Associate Superintendent
for Field Operations

File #300

September 13, 1978

TO: Principals of Senior High and AVT Schools

FROM: Richard D. Hanusey

SUBJECT: Period Allowances for Non-instructional Activities - 1978-79 - Revised

The maximum period allowances per week for the non-instructional activities listed below are as follows:

1.	Discipline	- 45 periods
2.	Finance	- 10 periods
3.	Publications	- 10 periods
4.	Senior Class Sponsor	- 5 periods
5.	Student Association	- 5 periods
6.	Testing	- 5 periods

In addition to the above allowances, please note the following:

1. All other non-instructional activities in schools are to be assigned to non-advisors, with no additional period allowances.

2. Additional responsibilities relating to the non-instructional activities listed above may also be assigned to non-advisors, with no additional period allowances.

3. Exclusive of instructional activities beyond the regular school day:

   a. Department heads who were assigned to teach at least 10 periods per week during the 1977-1978 school year are to be assigned to teach 10 periods per week; other department heads are to be assigned to teach 5 periods per week.

   b. The roster chairperson and the grade chairpersons are to be assigned to teach the same number of periods per week as they taught during the 1977-1978 school year.

(over please)

(9)

c. All teachers, with the possible exception of the roster chairperson, must be assigned to teach a minimum of 5 periods per week.

4. The maximum number of periods allocated to a department chairperson for supervisory activities is 5 per week.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Richard D'Ambrosio

bs

c: District Superintendents

(0)

SUPPLIES ALLOTMENT - GRADES K - 14 SCHOOL YEAR 1978 - 79

Parkway Program	(206)	3		1/10/79
School	Code	District	Principal	Date

GRADE OR SUBJECT	ENROLLMENT or UNITS 10/31/78		UNIT ALLOWANCE Per Pupil	UNIT ALLOWANCE Per Pupil Period	TOTAL ANNUAL ALLOWANCE	
1. Grades 10-14	Projected	Actual			Projected	Actual
General		870	$ 3.81	$	$	$ 3315
Less Science-See Science below					( )	( )
Art-Senior High		78		.82		64
Art-Tech High				1.34		
Commerce			.67			
Distributive Ed.				.67		
Home Economics				.57		
Child Devel. Lab.				.57		
Shop				1.37		
Mechanical Drawing				.93		
Music - Inst. & Vocal ***		44	2.37			104
Science *			1.08			
TOTAL ALLOTMENT - Grades 10 - 14					$	$
2. GRADES 7 - 9						
General		376	$ 3.61	$	$	$ 1357
Less Science-See Science below					( )	( )
Art		21		.62		13
Commerce			.36			
Home Economics				.41		
Shop				1.21		
Mechanical Drawing				.77		
Music - Inst. & Vocal ***		12	2.06			25
Science *			1.03			
TOTAL ALLOTMENT - GRADES 7 - 9					$	$
3. GRADES K - 6						
General 1 - 6			$ 3.40	$	$	$
PK & K			3.40			
TOTAL ALLOTMENT - GRADES K -6						
4. ADDITIONAL ALLOTMENTS						
E.I.P. (Elementary)			$ 2.06	$	$	$
Health Ed. Mat. (El. & Sec.)			30.00 per school			30
Library (Elem./Mid. & Sec.)			119/149 per school			149
Teacher Allowance **		54	10.00 per teacher			540
TOTAL ADDITIONAL ALLOTMENTS					$	$ 5597
5. NEW SCHOOL, NEW GRADES - Additional Allowance Compute on reverse side.					$	$ 0
6. TOTAL AT STATED ALLOWANCE RATES					$	$ 5597
			Adjustment Allowance 4			224
			GRAND TOTAL		$	$ 5821

* For pupils enrolled in Science
** Balance of $25.00 allowance shown on Book & Inst. Aids Allotment Sheet, Form EH 108
*** Per pupil in performance groups
Use Forms SE 2 and SE 22 for Special Education allowances

Form H 300, Allotment Sheet - Supplies - Elementary and Secondary Schools.
School District of Philadelphia (March, 1978)

(11)

BOOKS AND INSTRUCTIONAL AIDS ALLOTMENT - GRADES K - 14 SCHOOL YEAR 1978-79

Parkway Program (206) 3 1/10/79
School Code District Principal Date

GRADE OR SUBJECT	ENROLLMENT or UNITS 10/31/78 Projected	ENROLLMENT or UNITS 10/31/78 Actual	UNIT ALLOWANCE	TOTAL ANNUAL ALLOWANCE Projected	TOTAL ANNUAL ALLOWANCE Actual
1. GENERAL EDUCATION - Base					
Grades 9 - 14		1246	$8.67 per pupil		10,803
Grades 7 - 8			8.26 per pupil		
Grades 1 - 6			8.05 per pupil		
Kgn. and Pre-Kgn.			6.03 per pupil		
Sub-Total Base				$	$
2. GEN. ED. ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCE					
Grade 1			$ 3.86 per pupil		
EIP (ELEMENTARY)			2.06 per pupil		
Library (Elem./Mid. & Sec.)			119/242 per school		
Library - Grades 9 - 14		1246	2.06 per pupil		2,567
Grades 7 - 8			1.80 per pupil		
Grades 1 - 6			1.80 per pupil		
Commerce - Sr. & Tech.			3.55 per pupil		
Gr. 9 - Intro. to Bus.		30	2.68 per pupil		80
Teacher Allowance*		54	15.00 per teacher		810
Sub-Total Add'l Allow.				$	$
3. NEW SCHOOL, NEW GRADES - Additional Allowance Compute on reverse side				$	$ 0
4. TOTAL AT STATED ALLOWANCE RATES				$	$ 14,260
			Adjustment Allowance * 4		570
			GRAND TOTAL		14,830

* Balance of $25.00 allowance shown on Supplies Allotment Sheet, Form H 300

Use Forms SE 2 and SE 22 for Special Education allowances

Form EH 108, Allotment Sheet - Books and Instructional Aids - Elementary & Secondary Schools
School District of Philadelphia (March, 1978)

TO THE PRINCIPALS OF SENIOR HIGH AND AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOLS:

Please submit your recommendations in connection with the Afterschool Physical Education program in your school for the following school year on the form which appears below. The completed form must be returned to this office by Sep. 22, 1978. In making your recommendations, it is important that you keep in mind the basic philosophy laid down by the Superintendent with regard to this program. This is particularly true with regard to the number of participants and official opening and closing dates of the respective activities. Under Item "B" the total cost of salaries paid to teachers should be provided for in your school budget under Class 100-Personal Services-Item 102 - Seasonal Activities. Thank you very much.

BERNARD G. KELNER
Associate Superintendent
Curriculum and Instruction

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD D. HANUSEY
Associate Superintendent
Field Operations

IRVING M. BRODY
Director

PROGRAM FOR GIRLS — ALLOTMENT $ 5,300

A. In this space, list the nominees for the positions which you wish filled in 1978-79.

Approved List of Activities & Positions	Maximum Current Salary	Official Opening & Closing Dates	Nominees
Hockey Head Tchr.	$2271.	Opening of School in Sept. to Nov. 30	
Hockey 1st Asst.	1617.	" "	
Hockey 2nd Asst.	1081.	" "	
Volleyball Head Tchr.	2271.	" "	
Volleyball 1st Asst.	1617.	" "	
Volleyball 2nd Asst.	1081.	" "	
Bowling	929.	" "	
X-Country	1086.	" "	
Swimming	1086.	" "	
Basketball Head Tchr.	2608.	Dec. 1 to Feb. 28	
Basketball 1st Asst.	1617.	" "	
Basketball 2nd Asst.	1086.	" "	
Gymnastics Head Tchr.	1954.	Dec. 1 to Mar. 15	
Gymnastics 1st Asst.	959.	" "	
Archery	869.	Mar. 15 to June 15	
Badminton	1086.	" "	
Golf	869.	" "	
Softball Head Tchr.	2271.	" "	
Softball 1st Asst.	1629.	" "	
Softball 2nd Asst.	1086.	" "	
Tennis	1086.	" "	
Track Head Tchr.	2271.	" "	
Track 1st Asst.	1617.	" "	
Track 2nd Asst.	1184.	" "	

INTRAMURAL ACTIVITIES	SALARY	HOURS*	DATES	
Finance Manager	761.	Sept. to June 15		
Athletic Director	1834.	Sept. to June 15		

* The current rate of pay per hour is $14.67.

Sponsors of intramural activities may not receive a total salary greater than the amount indicated by the principal's recommendation.

B. _____ TOTAL cost of salaries for girls' program

SCHOOL _____ DATE _____

(13)

23

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
21st STREET SOUTH OF THE PARKWAY
19103

MICHAEL P. MARCASE
Superintendent of Schools

RICHARD D. HANUSEY
Associate Superintendent for Field Operations

File #300

November 1, 1978

TO: Principals of Senior High and Area Vocational-Technical Schools

FROM: Richard D. Hanusey

SUBJECT: Extra-Curricular (EC) Activities - Dramatics & Debating 1978-1979 School Year

The number of remunerative EC hours allotted follows:

1. Dramatics - 300
2. Debating - 100

Guidelines

1. The criteria to be used in the selection of teachers shall be established in accordance with terms of the PFT Agreement.

2. One or more teachers may serve in the programs. However, the number of remunerative EC hours in each program may not exceed the number indicated above.

3. Preparation of Form S 316:
   a. Refer to Payroll Procedures Manual, section 1.11, paragraphs IV, A. 2 and 4.
   b. On entries to be made, please note:
      1) Project: Dramatics & Debating - EC
      2) PBRS: 01 04 149
      3) Position Class. Code: 0904
      4) Pay Grade: 0150
      5) Pay Step: 01
      6) Rate of Pay: $14.67
      7) Project Dates: 9/78 | 6/79
   c. Forward original and one copy of completed Form S 316 to the Office for Field Operations as soon as possible. Upon receipt and approval of Form S 316 by Field Operations, the Time and Attendance Report (T & A) for the school will be developed by the Payroll Division. Any subsequent S 316 forms submitted during the year for additions and/or deletions must be accompanied by Form S307.

4. Preparation of Form S307
   a. Complete original form (enclosed) and two copies.
   b. Forward original to Office for Field Operations, Room 614, at same time S 316 forms are forwarded.
   c. Forward one copy to the district office; retain other copy.

5. Preparation or Extension Payroll T & A is to be made in accordance with procedures indicated in Payroll Procedures Manual, section 2.0, paragraph VIII, B.

6. The principal shall:
   a. Monitor each EC activity performed by teachers.
   b. Keep accurate and up-to-date records which indicate the number of EC hours served by each employe.
   c. Use the daily register copy of the T & A Report as a sign-in sheet for participating employes.

Richard D Hanmer

bs

enclosure

c: District Superintendents